DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 583 CE 021 721

AUTHOR Moody, Tom
TITLE Vocational Education, CETA, and Youth Unemployment: Meeting the Needs of Inner City Youth. Occasional Paper No. 50.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE Feb 79
NOTE 18p.; Speech presented at a staff development meeting at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (Columbus, Ohio, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS City Government; City Problems; Cost Effectiveness; *Disadvantaged Youth; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Job Training; Occupational Mobility; Program Content; *Unemployment; Urban Environment; Urban Youth; *Vocational Education; Youth Employment; Youth Problems; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment Training Administration; *Ohio (Columbus)

ABSTRACT

The Mayor of Columbus, Tom Moody, spoke on his views of CETA, unemployment, and vocational education. In his opinion, all required and most optional education should be vocational education; that is, it should equip people to be able to support themselves, to earn a living, and to be productive in our society. He pointed out several "fallacies" that related to the policy of full employment, such as the assumptions that all people want to work and that all jobs must offer upward mobility. In his discussion of the CETA programs in Columbus he described the operations of the various programs, such as SPEDY (Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth), the Job Corps, and the Young Adult Conservation Corps. While he recognized the need for training the disadvantaged, he felt that the programs often overlap and are not set up to use their funding in the most effective manner. These problems, he thought, may result from the motivation of politicians to acquire as much federal aid as possible for their constituency. After his speech, he answered questions on the issues he had raised. (EIG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED173583

Occasional Paper No. 50

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, CETA, AND YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT: MEETING THE NEEDS OF INNER CITY YOUTH

by

Tom Moody
Mayor of Columbus, Ohio

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

February 1979

CE 021 721

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Magisos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE NATIONAL CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The National Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

ED 172283

The Lecture Series at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education was established to provide a forum for discussing current issues confronting educational research and development among distinguished professionals and National Center and Ohio State University staff. Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent official National Center or Ohio State University position or policy.

PREFACE

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education at The Ohio State University welcomes Tom Moody, Mayor of Columbus, Ohio, and his presentation, "Vocational Education, CETA, and Youth Unemployment: Meeting the Needs of Inner City Youth."

As Mayor of Columbus since 1972, Mr. Moody presents his views on CETA, youth unemployment, and vocational education from a local perspective. He points out that all education ought to be "vocational" in the sense that it prepares people to support themselves, to earn a living, and to be productive in society. Additionally, he describes several "fallacies" that relate to the policy of full employment—fallacies such as assuming that it is necessary for everyone to work and that there always must be a high degree of upward mobility on the job.

Mr. Moody also discusses the CETA-sponsored programs operating in Columbus and their purposes. He stresses the importance of research as a vehicle to find ways to place people in the job market and keep them there.

Prior to becoming Mayor, Mr. Moody served as a Judge with the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas and Municipal Courts. A native of Columbus, he received a B.S. in business administration from The Ohio State University and a law degree from Capital University. He is President of the National League of Cities and the International Union of Local Authorities and Member of the Advisory Board of the United States Conference of Mayors and the Advisory Council for Intergovernmental Relations appointed by former President Ford.

It is with great pleasure that the National Center welcomes Mayor Tom Moody and his lecture, "Vocational Education, CETA, and Youth Unemployment: Meeting the Needs of Inner City Youth."

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, CETA, AND YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT: MEETING THE NEEDS OF INNER CITY YOUTH

As some of my educational accomplishments were recited in my introduction, for some strange reason I thought back to a time about ten years ago when I was waiting for my appointment with the dentist. Being a compulsive reader, I turned to a movie magazine because that was the only thing there was to read. I read one whole magazine, and there is only one thing I remember out of it—a short article which interviewed Marlon Brando. The reporter asked Brando what he had found to be most difficult about becoming rich and famous. Brando responded, "When you are rich and famous as a movie star is, people begin to ask your advice on all kinds of subjects which you know nothing about. After a while you begin to give that advice." I feel that that is where I am today. My credentials are in a totally different field. I am not an expert in your field or anything close to it. On the other hand I do have some exposure to it—and knowledge about it—some good and some bad. I also have some ignorance of it, which I must presume that we as educated people would conclude is all bad. I will not be lengthy in my remarks, but I would like you to think about the questions you would like to ask me as Mayor of Columbus. I will answer candidly any questions about the city of Columbus and its involvement that I can answer. I also will tell you candidly if I don't know the answer. If I'm not mistaken, you will probably be able to discern very quickly when I don't know the answer. With regard to the national view, I have a perspective which might prove to be helpful to you on some occasion. The perspective is the view I get from the local officials—the policy makers at the local level. I hear their comments about what ought to be done, what is being done, and what is wrong with what is being done.

I don't really hear too many comments about what is good because the politicians are not really interested in the programs that are working well. Most politicians have to spend all of their time with programs that are not working well. We have a little difficulty in finding what works well and what doesn't. We occasionally brag about the good things, but that is in a different context. I will spare you most of that. I think I should identify where I am personally because I have what I prefer to call "prejudgments" rather than prejudices.

In the first place, I am in one of the smallest clubs in the United States—that is the club of white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, male, Republican mayors of large cities. There are three of us. There is a fourth who would be eligible, but she is a woman. This gives you some perspective on where I come from. Secondly, I don't have any notion of the definitions which are in your minds on some of the words that I use. For example, vocational education means something to you, and I am sure it means something quite different to me. One of my prejudgments is that all required and most optional education ought to be vocational education. I do not have any problems with people who want to take college courses in bridge or art appreciation. I don't mean to snub that approach, but to me, all education, including classical education that is required, ought to be vocational education in some sense. It ought to equip people to be able to support themselves, to earn a living, and to be productive in our society. I am fearful that some might conclude that I am against studying some areas just for the joy of studying them. I don't really have objections to courses in chess, pool, or whatever else is offered, because I think that

some of those courses improve the quality of life and can indeed contribute to a vocation. I attended a seminar on pool and billiards on campus which I understand was being given for credit. I watched some people who had made a vocation of that sport. They did very well and were also very good teachers. They were able to set me up very quickly so that I could do tricks if I just hit the ball in the right place. I think there is some value in that. Essentially I want you to understand that I really believe that a great many people come out of our educational system—particularly at the high school level but all too frequently with bachelor's degrees—not equipped to do anything for which they think they are fitted. They are equipped to do things which they think are beneath their dignity and not in keeping with their education. It doesn't make any difference whether I am right or wrong. That is my view on the matter and you ought to know it as we discuss some other things.

Let me suggest also that I have the conviction that municipal government, as an instrument of the federal government, is involved in a lot of activities in which it really should not be involved because it has very little expertise, background, and so on, in those areas. The entire manpower problem is one of those areas in which I personally feel that we should not be involved. The world is not ideal in that regard and I will comment on that more a little bit later. Next, I honestly believe that the municipalities are faced with the problem of dealing with failure—failure of the home, failure of the school, and failure of the church. Most municipal problems, other than those involving sewer, water, and some of our environmental problems in connection with industry, are the result of the failures of those other institutions. It is not surprising that federal programs designed to do something about those people who have not gained marketable skills from those other systems have been developed.

It really is not surprising that in the political climate of the last twenty years, the federal government has chosen to make the instrument of delivering their programs, the municipality or something akin to the municipality. There was at one time a congressional feeling that there should not be local directions for these programs, and indeed, federal bureaucracies were created to administer most of the vocational programs, training programs, and so on. Absolute scandal, in some degree, began to change that political climate. In addition, the local government officials were always saying in the halls of Congress and in personal conversations with federal officials that we could do better if given more flexibility and more self-determination at the local level. I happen to share that view. I don't think we have a great success story to prove that view, but I do believe that we have fewer abuses and fewer wastes of time because of that local self-determination. What we did not bring to the process was any knowledge of what we were doing. The thing that we did bring to the process was concern—a willingness to learn and the ability to watch very closely, to amend, and to take advantage of the things that seem to work, and to avoid things that do not seem to work.

The rhetoric of American politics today is full employment. Whether we look at it from the standpoint of human service agencies, the building of tax revenues, simple human dignity in being able to afford some of the things that any human being ought to have, or whether we look at it as a political device because it seems to work well, we all talk full employment in one way or another. I believe there is one basic fallacy in that rhetoric and in the actions which legislatures and administrators take. That fallacy is to assume that 100 percent of the population really wants to work. I don't want to argue about how large the percent who don't want to work is.

I recognize that that comment will offend some. Yet I find this to be one of the greatest problems that we, as administrators, face. It accounts for the large turnover in many of our programs; it also accounts for dropouts, for low placement rates, and so on. We've gotten smarter because we now compute placement rates by measuring those who complete a program and not those who start a program. I think also we make a mistake in trying to measure those

programs the way we conventionally measure "productivity" or "success," or whatever word you want to substitute. We are in very large measure dealing with the dregs of our society. You might not like the word "dregs." Let me choose a different phrase. The programs are targeted, and ought to be, at "those who are not able to get into the system and perform at a satisfactory level within the system." There has to be some reason why they can't perform—why they can't stay. Whether or not we make a moral judgment about this being good or bad, there are certain people who just can't perform satisfactorily in the system. I am not just talking about individuals such as the lame and the blind. I am talking about people who just simply can't perform. In dealing with those people, I think it is reasonable that we should expect a very low rate of success. We ought to be willing to tolerate that rate of success just as we tolerate trying to reform alcoholics. They are people and have some worth. We ought to do the best we can and we ought to save some. Those whom we don't save, or at least not immediately, should not be chalked up as the victims of a bureaucratic inefficiency, or a typically wasteful government program that will produce nothing.

From a political point of view, I think there is another fallacy. I am talking "political" here in a scholarly sense rather than Democrat or Republican politics. That fallacy is that it is really necessary for everyone to work, and it is really necessary for everyone to have a high degree of upward mobility with career prospects. Now that may sound like harassment. The fact is that many individuals in our labor market—from the standpoint of the buyers of labor—are in areas where there is not and cannot under our present system be a high degree of upward mobility. Let me illustrate. One of the major tasks that we have in a municipality is to clean the litter from the streets. If you look at our streets you know that we need more people to do that than we presently have. The political rhetoric of our age is such that cleaning the streets is looked upon as a demeaning dead-end job with no real vitality in the economic system. Thus we are trying to train everybody to do jobs better than that. In the meantime we choke in litter. We have to send people out to do it. There are no machines that can do it as well as people can. So to the extent that we succeed with our aims of providing everybody with a meaningful job, of providing everybody with upward mobility, we really get cut short on the other end with the question of who is going to go out and pick up the trash so that the quality of life in our community will be better for all people. We could name some other jobs of that kind. Some of them are rather well-paying jobs. Let us look at chemists who are employed in a waste water treatment plant. I don't remember exactly what we are paying those people but I think it is somewhere between $17,000 and $23,000. Yet there is almost no upward mobility any place in the country for persons in those kinds of positions. Many municipal jobs and many jobs in private industry do not really have good prospects of upward mobility. I hope you don't misunderstand and conclude that I think the waste water chemists should have the opportunity for upward mobility and not take advantage of it. If the person who picks up litter does a better job of it then anybody else but is offered a position with a construction company, I think that that ought to happen. My point is simply that there is not that much upward mobility for many people. Those of us that spout the rhetoric about meaningful employment for upward mobility and career prospects are saying something that really doesn't apply to most of the people whom we are trying to help. Let us look at the police officer. A police or a fire department is structured in such a way that several hundred individuals are at the bottom. In a lifetime only three or four individuals will move to the top. Only a small fraction will advance to the middle. If they would all get to the top or the middle, then there wouldn't be anybody available to drive the cruisers. Somehow it seems to me that we ignore this. I have spent a lot of time making the point that we ignore it. Again, it doesn't make any difference if I am right or wrong, but that is the rhetoric I hear from the applicants who are rebuffed by CETA programs, who drop out of CETA programs, or who say that they have looked everywhere and can't find a job. These applicants come to me in my open door sessions and say they can get all those jobs that they don't want. Thus, there is a market for the jobs that

people won't have. The jobs that need to be performed are those that people won't have and are not being done. I recognize that you don't really want to deal with that problem, but you would rather provide vocational education for those who have the potential and that is extremely valuable. But it is not the total problem from the standpoint of the politician.

Let me comment briefly on my views on the new CETA legislation and how it operates in the city of Columbus. You probably know more about some of these titles than I do. Columbus has a program under Title II of the CETA Act. Title II's intent it to provide basic employment and training services—both to youth and adults—that offer transitional public service employment positions for residents in Franklin County. The participants are employed in the city and county governments and in nonprofit agencies providing necessary public services. The Department of Labor regulations do not specify this but in conversations with individuals in the Department of Labor, I discovered that they encourage the nonprofit sector jobs because they somehow feel that as a matter of philosophy there is more potential for permanent employment in the nonprofit agencies then there is in the governmental roles. I think that is probably a good guess but it is incorrect because the nonprofit agencies are for the most part more straightened than the governments. They are seizing upon these training opportunities to augment their staff without any real expectations of ever being able to put those people to work on their own payrolls. In addition, the nonprofit agencies for the most part are very specialized, and within a community they are often the only employer performing that type of work at all. So there is no opportunity within the area of residence for that person to transfer to another job with a marketable skill. Now skills such as those needed to be a typist, a file clerk, or positions of that sort, may be considered transferable skills. But if the skill is something different from that—if it tends to be identified with one single problem—there is no place to transport that except out of the community. The chances of transporting it out of the community to one single agency in one single county anyplace else in the state are pretty slim because people don't have the know-how to do that kind of thing.

In Title IV, the city of Columbus has a number of programs. Title IV is directed almost totally to youth. There are all sorts of programs with acronyms which I can't pronounce and I don't understand, but let me give you some examples. There is one we call SPEDY—Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth. SPEDY provides in-school youth between the ages of 14 and 21 a work experience of twenty-four hours per week in positions in state, county, and local governments, and in nonprofit agencies. Classroom training is also offered at the four metropolitan career centers. The SPEDY program lasts nine weeks. This program is a difficult way to deal with people in that age bracket. You would be surprised at how small physically some of the "14-year-olds" are because there is some fibbing about who is really 14 years of age. At age 21 there are people who are both physically and mentally mature. In a nine-week program how can you segregate these people into workable groups; and how can you provide the specialized activities that ought to be available for that age group of between 14 and 21? It is difficult when you don't know who they are or in what proportions they will come until you get the program under way and until you work to meet quotas indicated by the Department of Labor. After all, these programs have two purposes. One is to provide some meaningful training to the participants. The other is to stimulate the economy. We don't talk so much about stimulating the economy in programs of this sort. But I suggest that if you could get the members of Congress who vote for these kinds of programs to tell the whole truth, you would find that they use these programs partially to get the kids in their jurisdictions off the streets, to give them a little pocket money, and to provide some relief for some very disadvantaged families. We know the general cynicism about the productivity of such programs. Why then are they sustained? Is it that Congress is blinded to the results? That may be part of it, but another part of it is that members of Congress want the dollars in their jurisdiction. I am not saying that that is bad. I just want to recognize it as one of the facts that's involved.

Another program we have is YCCIP—the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects. The purpose of this program is to provide economically disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 19 full- and part-time positions in projects providing public services in community improvement. We can see some overlapping of qualifications and ages in these programs and there are more to come. There is also the YETP—the Youth Employment Training Program—which is really similar to Title II. Yet it is limited to services with youth between the ages of 14 and 21. There are two main components—an in-school program with the local school system which provides career employment experience, and an employment services center which provides youth career occupational training classes and other training opportunities.

There also is the Title V program, the Job Corps, which is designed to serve dropout youth between the ages of 16 and 21 in residential and nonresidential centers. The purpose of the Job Corps is to provide participating youth marketable skills and a GED certificate. Another program is Title VI which is an emergency public service job program designed to fluctuate with the economy. Its target is the long-term unemployed positions in state, county, and local governments, and nonprofit agencies. It also provides employees to those agencies with special projects that could not be undertaken without assistance, e.g., the 400 or so people that we hired to shovel snow off the streets and clear the storm sewer openings last winter. Another program is the private sector initiative program. It provides on-the-job training and other special employment programs within the private sector in coordination with our private sector people.

Title VII, the Young Adult Conservation Corps, is a program designed to serve out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 and 23, with opportunities to participate in conservation activities at Columbus metropolitan sites. The certification and referral of eligible youth is to be made by the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services. The Columbus-Franklin County consortium is responsible, through a nonfinancial agreement, for referring applicants to the employment services. Then in turn Employment Services confirms the hires of the consortium as a prime sponsor. There is no local allocation since the administering agencies are the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior as opposed to the Department of Labor. We administer a couple of other programs through CETA. One of those is designed to serve three primary groups—disabled veterans, Viet Nam veterans, and other veterans. This is accomplished through on-the-job training. One that we are not yet administering is the EOP—the Employment Opportunities Program. In July and August of this year this program was the first step in the welfare reform program put forth by President Carter. It was still called that when representatives from pilot cities were called to an area just outside Washington, D.C. for a seminar on the program. There are fifteen prime sponsors across the country—a few in large cities, a few in small cities, and a few with rural and township governments. This program is just in the planning stage but its impact on the Columbus community will be enormous. It consists of $31 million a year for two years and our planning grant as I recall is something over $300,000. Let's put this in perspective. In the Columbus-Franklin County area we are going to be getting $31 million a year for two years. General revenue sharing, about which we mayors fight so hard, provides approximately $8 million a year to the city of Columbus and about $4 million to the county. So this two-year experimental program puts more dollars into our community than general revenue sharing which we mayors fight for. I think you can begin to see why we have some problems that refer back to what I mentioned earlier. Even if we make mistakes—even if we really mess up a $31 million-a-year program, you can be sure of one thing—that is that we spent the entire $31 million in Franklin County. There are a lot of city officials, a lot of congressional people, to whom this is a quite real factor.

Another program of interest is the skills training improvement program. I really don't know a lot about it. My CETA director advises me that the purpose is to provide participants with new

skills to meet industry needs for specific job requirements as determined by industry, and to increase private sector participation in the design and operation of employment and training programs. Proposed training will be in primary labor markets. That's just a view of what is happening in Columbus. I surely hope that you professionals understand it all a lot better than I do, because what I see is overlapping. I see kids saying, "I'm here to apply for a job and I hear you've got the jobs." How in the world do I have anybody smart enough on the city payroll to determine where these people ought to be, and to place them handily with dignity and care, with love and concern, so that they aren't turned off by bureaucracy? The people I hired to determine this were in the same position just a few months ago. That may sound terribly cynical. I don't want you to think that I am cynical. I am trying to be practical. It wouldn't make any difference whether we hired someone off the street who had been out of work for two years to determine which position these people should be in, or whether I went down to that office personally, with all my degrees to make the determination. I wouldn't know what to do either. That is part of our problem. Nobody at any level knows what to do. That is why I am here talking to you folks. The major point I make is that no matter how much you care, no matter how much you identify with the problem, no matter how much money you have to deal with the problem, you still have an awfully big job to do, and one that our society knows little about.

There is one great difference between my attitude and the attitude of many others, and that is my willingness to admit that we do not know what we are doing. When we testify before Congress, it is not difficult to say that we at the local level know more about this than anybody else—and certainly more than those at the federal level—and that we ought to run these programs. First, I believe that. Second, it is honest. Third, it makes sure that we get to try it instead of bringing in a federal bureaucracy, which is not responsive to us. But the simple fact is that this problem remains one about which our society doesn't have good information. That's not all bad. If we had good information we would not need this vocational research center and we would not need the $5 million a year that is going into it to maintain some of our jobs. I don't say that in a nasty way. I think it is a proper commitment of money to find out what we are doing—what is successful and what isn't. There are a lot of failures in research. But all accomplishment comes from failure. I like to quote what Thomas Edison said when he was asked about his progress in developing the light bulb. He replied that he was coming along fine. He knew 3,000 ways that didn't work. As a society that is what we are finding. We know a lot of ways that don't work in education, that don't work in putting people in the job market, that don't work in keeping them there. We have not been so successful in finding ways to get people in and keep them there. On the other hand, if we look at a national unemployment rate of 6 percent, maybe we haven't done such a bad job at all because we have found a way to keep 94 percent of the people working.

We are concentrating an enormous amount of money on dealing with the failures of the system. I would say to you that I think it is criminal to ignore the failures in the system. As a society we chose a long time ago not to shoot them, and not to let them starve to death. The concomitant result of that is that we agree to pay for them. We must house them, feed them, and clothe them in one way or another. It is in our best interest to somehow get them into the system—at least some of them into the system—and make them productive. I believe it is humane and intelligent. As a conservative Republican who has never been identified as a bleeding heart, I will tell you that I think it is right that we spend part of our resources to get those people working because it costs us less. I can stand beside the greatest liberal who talks about the essential dignity and worth of humanity. Additionally, I will vote to support that program because I think that is one place in which liberalism and conservatism come together—when they deal with giving the individuals the chance to do a better job at a smaller cost to our society.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question: How can we get educational and service agencies to work together and overcome problems of coordination and turf?

In discussing the educational and CETA sectors, I would like to say first that there is a great deal of prejudice in both of those camps. Those in the educational camp probably look a little disdainfully at the bureaucratic camp because they feel the bureaucrats are untried, unseasoned, and admittedly new in that field and because they probably have been chosen by political patronage. On the other hand, those people in the administrative camp tend to think that if the educators knew what they were doing, there wouldn't be problems such as unemployment in the country to begin with. So we have those mindsets to deal with. The only way that I know to deal with them is for the policy makers to *insist* that they be dealt with. For example when our CETA agency entered into its first contract with the Columbus Board of Education for the Skills Center, it was done against all the professional advice of my staff. I told them that we were going to have at least one program that was coordinated with the Board of Education. They said they didn't think it would work very well. I said that we can prove it doesn't work very well, and then we will learn something about how to proceed in the future. We will have a standard against which to measure new programs.

Today there is a lot of talk about ways to measure programs, whether our measuring devices make sense, and how they compare on a cost-benefit ratio. We are very imperfect in this area and there is no reason why we shouldn't be. This area is more complicated than trying to get to the moon, and we have the best scientific minds in the country working on that. We are trying to deal with a societal problem that has existed throughout recorded history and we have never figured out how to deal with it. So there is a lot of slippage. Basically, the only answer I know to achieving better coordination is to have the policy makers insist on it. But to have the policy makers insist upon it, they must have knowledge and rationales which few of the policy makers have today. People aren't elected to positions such as mayor, member of City Council, county commissioner, or governor because they know a lot about employment or about education. They get elected because they say, "We are going to see to it that people have employment. We are going to provide education." I think it is the responsibility of the professionals—the kinds of people who are here at the National Center—to gain the attention of the policy makers and to make a rational case. That may be pretty hard, given that many educators have poor opinions of politicians. I have only made a complaint about a newspaper reporter once in my life. The editor of the paper asked me, If my reporter is so stupid, why aren't you smart enough to use him better? My advice to you as educated professionals is to teach these politicians if they don't understand. I think we must always put the burden on the professionals. You have become part of an elite group and your burden as the elite is trying to get the politicians to understand what has to be done. Some of them will even listen and a somewhat smaller percentage will even understand. When there is understanding there is hope.

Question: You mentioned that there is a certain percent of people across the country who don't want to work. What is this percent? And what are the reasons for this "non-desire" to work?

In terms of numbers, it is totally impossible to estimate, even if I made a scientific effort to do so. The kinds of data which we keep, and the methods by which they are reported, do not provide really good information on even such obvious things as the number of blacks and whites who are unemployed. When there are definite understatements in our federal data about unemployed youth, with a margin of error—which many mayors believe may range as high as 20 to 40 percent in our cities—it becomes obvious that there is no way I can tell you how many of those people really don't want to work. I believe that most of them *do* want to work. If I had to guess, I would conclude that it is 1, 2, or 3 percent.

As for the reasons, I don't regard the unwillingness to work as pure perverseness. I think there are several factors that lead to unwillingness—genetic, nutritional, sociocultural factors. In many cases all of those may be operating at once. One of the reasons I believe it is important to fund research is so that we can deal with problems such as these. For example, we haven't really established that there is a relationship between crime and unemployment. All of the politicians and criminal experts talk about it. All of the union leaders talk about it. Yet the statistics I have studied seem to indicate that the only relationship that exists is between crime and age. On the basis of those studies I'm prepared to predict that the crime rates will continue to fall for the next twenty years as people in our society get older. My simple answer to the cause of the unwillingness to work is that I don't know, but I don't think it is a matter of sheer perversity. I don't think we should make moral judgment to ignore people on that grounds. I would also say that in our supportive and counseling services we ought to be thinking about giving medical examinations and psychiatric examinations. I would hazard a personal guess, with no documentation whatsoever except that it reflects the current state of some investigation I am doing—that nutritional deficiencies might be the cause of many of our societal problems. But we don't have the expertise to determine that.

Question: In the work incentive program, how is the salary for the CETA student determined and what is its purpose?

The purpose of the salary is twofold: (1) to provide an incentive for a person to participate in the program, and (2) to stimulate the economy. The amount of the salary is based on the minimum wage. Additionally, there is a tax advantage for the employer who participates and that is some kind of partial subsidy. There may be slightly different arrangements on a particular job but I am not sure of that. It is very difficult for a small business to provide the kind of supervision which is necessary—or at least necessary in *their* opinion—for the people who are attracted to the program, so a lot of businesses don't want any part of it. A number of business people feel that they have adequate supervisory talent already on board and that they can deal with a handful of people. There has been a surprising number of success stories within the WIN program, for example. There also has been a surprising number of disappointments on the part of businesses. I am sorry I cannot answer your question better. Odella Welch, my director of community services, could answer or could give you the name of the person who knows.

Question: What is the city of Columbus doing and what can other cities do to deliver manpower services that are needed to facilitate the transition from school to work?

I will have to give a guarded answer to that question. First, the city of Columbus is trying to fill every one of the allocated slots so the unemployed youth get into our programs and get paid.

Secondly, we are trying to teach them how to perform some skill in all of these programs. But a problem arises because the supervisors who are necessary to do the best job are not available. Some of them may be able to supervise well enough to get the job done, but they don't add a "richness" dimension in the sense of discipline, character building, incentives for changing lifestyles, and all of the other things we would like to see accomplished. I believe this is one of the fallacies in our programs and it reflects in a hidden way what I was talking about earlier on economic stimulus. The politician justifies these programs to stimulate the economy and to take care of the disadvantaged by getting the dollars out to the people who need them. But when we don't want to tie up the money in administration, and want to get it out to the poor, the disadvantaged, the blacks, the women, we end up hiring them but don't give them a supervisor who knows how to teach them anything. We certainly cannot buy trucks and equipment and other such things with dollars that are meant for the unemployed. That's why we end up with ten people standing on a street corner to clean out one catch basin. We cannot transport them to where they are needed. We cannot provide them other kinds of tools. We cannot hire supervisors to watch over them. I have not answered your question well but I have answered it candidly. We need to do some rethinking about supervision in these programs. We need to get off the kick about getting all the dollars out to the target areas. If we get the dollars out to the targeted people and don't provide them with a meaningful, worthwhile experience—an experience that leaves them with some kind of marketable skill—then it's all been a giant fraud. There is nobody that can detect the fraud faster than the target group. The administrator will always justify the fraud because it justifies the job. The person who is in the target group doesn't see any sense in protesting against federal policy.

Question: Many youth have just never been able to make the transition from school to work—perhaps not because they are deficient—but because we have some deficient institutions. What kinds of institutional changes can we make to improve this transition from school to work?

Your question would include the college graduates with bachelor's degrees who cannot get in the job market, the economically and culturally disadvantaged as well as the superadvantaged in many cases. I really do not have an answer to that without beginning to tread on some toes. Look at the situation for example with the professionals who are in the education business. I look at Columbus, central Ohio, and the nation and see declining enrollments for the next twenty years in the primary and secondary schools. Yet a lot of bright, dedicated young people are realizing the family ambition at the family expense and are training to become teachers. It appears to me that we are going to have a tremendous glut of teachers for the future. I doubt if people in the College of Education are sending a letter to enrollees which warns them that they are spending four years of their lives in school and may have to train for another career later. I'm exaggerating my response for the purpose of clarity. I think that is also true in a number of other fields. My son is a sophomore here at Ohio State and is studying geology. He has not quite determined whether to become a geologist or a geophysicist but he concluded only a week ago that he has no employment prospects until after he has completed his Ph.D. Because the technological needs in the area which he wants to enter are so complicated, he says the only positions he could secure as a graduate with a master's or bachelor's degree are clerk or surveyor. I don't have the answer to these kinds of problems. I think that now—more than ever before—the vocational educators are attempting the kinds of training that match these employment markets. But the information received from industry will probably not always be the correct information because industries cannot always project the right information. For the most part, if industries anticipate a particular skill need, it is not good for them to publicize it too much, because they will be tipping off a future marketable item and they want to market their product before anybody else does. I don't know the extent to which this self-interest clouds the data. I know of certain instances in which it does.

Question: When you were relating all of the programs that the city of Columbus runs you raised a basic issue that is very prevalent in the CETA literature—that is the erosion of a decentralized, decategorized delivery system, which was the original intent of CETA. Although these programs such as the Youth Bill and Title VI, Public Service Employment, have added a considerable amount of money to all the different prime sponsors, they have simultaneously eroded the flexibility that prime sponsors have or intended to have in delivering services to meet the local needs of all the prime sponsors. What will happen in the future when there are very specific programs, specific eligibility requirements, and projects on which money must be spent in the different titles?

That is an excellent question. I don't really know what will happen, but I am willing to share my prediction with you. The history that you recite is indicative of a continuing turf struggle which I have alluded to previously. There is the thinking of the locally elected people and appointed people that they know their communities best and if given a flexible program, they can maximize the values of that program within their local areas. As you know, I subscribe to that. On the other hand there are those in federal government who must justify their existence. We at the local level rail against the feds and they rail against us. What we are really saying is that neither of us knows what to do, but those at the federal level are accountable to someone above them, too. When they examine programs at the local level, they must return with a report that tells what is being done and what is not being done. They tailor the reports more to the philosophy of their bosses than to any standards which are in the regulations or in the legislation itself. We've never been able to figure out another way to do it. In addition, under the locally administered legislation the Congress member does not get as much individual publicity and credit as he/she used to get under the categorical grants. This is a major factor. Members of Congress will deny it, but it is a major factor. That's one of the reasons that general revenue sharing is always in trouble. Members of Congress can never announce that they have $6 million to spend on Columbus. Once the legislation is passed, they know that they are going to get a certain number of dollars for several years. I am not talking about all members of Congress. Again, it's the age-old fight of whether to let the experts from Washington do it or the experts from Hometown, USA do it. This also happens when adjoining neighborhood commissions exist. They want to clean up the stream that runs through both of them and neither one trusts the other commission. I don't know how to correct it.

Question: Earlier you pointed out some of the limitations in providing meaningful programs because of equipment shortages, lack of good supervisory personnel, and so on. Maybe some of those programs ought to be contracted back to institutional-based training. One of the main points of contention with recent CETA legislation has been the percentage which would be contracted or assigned to institutional-based training. What are the limitations of going that route or what adjustments need to be made in institutional-based training in order to make it more meaningful and a more promising and beneficial route?

Again my answer to a large part of what you ask is that I don't know but I'm not going to hesitate to venture an opinion. I'm not really sure that I understand institutional-based training. It may go back to my discussions of the litter assignments which I chose because that job is perceived as being demeaning by many people. A couple of valuable lessons come out of that kind of training, such as learning to find the work site, getting there on time, learning that a fifteen-minute coffee break is a fifteen-minute break, learning that a lunch hour is an hour, and so on. It seems ridiculous for us to talk about it in this room, in this setting. Yet I can tell you that there are literally hundreds of employees in much better jobs who honestly don't understand the

importance of those things. For example, in one division of the city of Columbus, more than 400 people work at an average salary of better than $12,000 a year. With overtime many of them make $17,000 to $20,000 a year. Yet on a rainy Monday I will see a 35 percent absenteeism rate in that particular work force.

To this extent I'm not sure that we should go back to institutional-based training. In some other cases it might very well go back to the traditional vocational education schools. But that becomes a guess on my part because I cannot think of any ready examples. If we look at the way the affirmative action programs with women and minorities work, we see that we take people who lack basic skills into employment slots. For example, it is difficult to teach many people how to read meters in a sewer plant. In addition, some people who have been on the job for a year and perform the task well, take a civil service test and have trouble because they have to read meter faces on the test. They say they failed the test because the meter runs backwards from the ones they read on the job. This is a big problem. They then want to appeal the whole civil service test and go to court because they feel they have been cheated because the dial face on the test was counterclockwise rather than clockwise. Maybe some of those people ought to go back to institutional-based training. I understand how these people feel. But we're not too adept at locating and predicting those situations. Additionally, that situation only affected three people. Given that we could anticipate it, I don't know how we would have put together a program for those three people, particularly when our real job is not to get those three people a job but to operate a sewer plant properly. The civil service system is set up to test people so that we can hire the best qualified. I think it more or less militates against the things that we are talking about in this vocational education field, particularly with regard to the disadvantaged groups. The whole idea of civil service is that tests are administered to come up with not only the competent but the best of the competent—that is the top three. The "competents" farther down the list cannot be brought into the system because the government doesn't want to waste time on training people. That merit system can be looked at as an elitist system that denies many minorities opportunities. Police officers and fire fighters are good examples of the kinds of jobs in this system. Hundreds of people take the tests for these positions. If we need fifty police officers, there probably will be 700 people who will pass the test. There will probably just be one black and one women in the top twenty, maybe the top fifty, which is not the proportions that we need. That deviates from your question somewhat, but with regard to the city services, we always have the problems of designing the program to serve a limited number of people. I want to thank you for tolerating a nonexpert in your field.

LEADERSHIP SERIES IN VOCATIONAL AND CAREER EDUCATION

Barlow, Melvin. ***Implications from the History of Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 15—$1.00).

Bell, Terrel H. ***The Place of Vocational Education in Higher Education: Implications for Education R&D***, 1976 (DL 4—$1.50).

Bell, Terrel H. and Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education: The U.S.O.E. Perspective***, 1974 (OC 4—$1.50).

Bottoms, James E. ***Implications of the New Vocational Education Legislation for Program Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 23—$1.75).

Buzzell, Charles H. ***Productivity: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 19—$1.00).

Clark, David L. ***Federal Policy in Educational Research and Development***, 1974 (OC 5—$1.50).

Clark, David L. ***Research and Development Productivity in Educational Organizations***, 1978 (OC 41—$2.20).

Cohen, Wilbur J. ***Needed Federal Policy in Education for Century III***, 1977 (OC 24—$1.90).

Cyphert, Frederick. ***Forces Affecting Program Development in Higher Education: Is Anyone Driving?*** 1975 (OC 11—$1.00).

Delacruz, Joseph B. ***Educational Programs for Native Americans: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 40—$1.90).

Ellis, John. ***Vocational Education and Federal Priorities***, 1978 (OC 47—$1.90).

Ellis, Mary L. ***Vocational Education: The Future Is Now***, 1978 (OC 37—$1.90).

Evans, Rupert. ***Vocational Education R and D in the Past Decade: Implications for the Future***, 1976 (OC 18—$1.00).

Fallstrom, Charles M. ***The Changing Secondary Education Scene: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 22—$1.75).

Gideonse, Hendrik. ***A Model for Educational Research and Development: 1985***, 1978 (OC 44—$2.20).

Ginzberg, Eli. ***Strategies for Education Reform***, 1972-73 (DL 1—$1.00).

Gleazer, Edmund J. ***View on Community and Junior College Education***, 1975 (OC 9—$1.00).

Goldhammer, Keith. ***Extending Career Education Beyond the Schoolhouse Walls***, 1974 (OC 3—$2.00).

Halperin, Samuel. ***Emerging Educational Policy Issues in the Federal City: A Report from Washington***, 1978 (OC 42—$2.20).

Herr, Edwin L. ***Work Focused Guidance for Youth in Transition: Some Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 43—$2.20).

Hicks, Laurabeth L. ***Programs of Guidance and Counseling Becoming of Age: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 1977 (OC 25—$1.75).

Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences***, 1973-74 (DL 2—$1.25).

Jennings, John F. and Radcliffe, Charles W. ***Commentary on Legislation Affecting Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1977 (OC 27—$1.90).

Kolstoe, Oliver P. ***Implications of Research Findings on Vocational and Career Education for the Mentally Handicapped***, 1977 (OC 33—$1.90).

Kottman, Roy M. ***Building a Constituency for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 10—$1.00).

Krathwohl, David. ***Improving Educational Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 21—$2.20).

Kreitlow, Burton W. ***Trends in Adult Education with Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 13—$1.25).

Kruger, Daniel H. ***Occupational Preparation Programs: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 31—$1.90).

Levitan, Sar A. ***The Unemployment Numbers Is the Message***, 1977 (OC 38—$1.90).

McCage, Ronald D. ***The Development of a Comprehensive State Capacity for Program Improvement***, 1978 (OC 34—$1.75).

McCune, Shirley D. ***The Organized Teaching Profession and R&D***, 1977 (OC 29—$1.90).

Marland, Sidney P. ***Career Education: Retrospect and Prospect***, 1974-75 (DL 3—$2.00).

Martin, Edwin. ***New Directions in Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Implications for Research and Devleopment***, 1978 (OC 35—$1.75).

Parnes, Herbert S. ***A Conceptual Framework for Human Resource Policy: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 14—$1.00).

Petty, Reginald. ***Trends and Issues in Vocational Education: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 46—$1.90).

Pucinski, Roman. ***The Role of State and Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education***, 1978 (OC 36—$1.90).

Reider, Corinne H. ***Women, Work and Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 26—$1.90).

Rosen, Howard. ***Recent Manpower Legislation and Programs: Implications for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 7—$1.00).

Scanlon, Robert C. ***Public Schools for the 80's: Implications for Vocational and Career Education R&D***, 1976 (OC 20—$1.50).

Siffin, William. ***Institutional Building in Technical Assistance: The Design Perspective and Some Implications for Research and Development in Vocational Education***, 1975 (OC 8—$1.00).

Simpson, Elizabeth J. ***The Home as a Learning Center for Vocational Development***, 1976 (OC 16—$1.00).

Sticht, Thomas G. ***Literacy and Vocational Competence***, 1978 (OC 39—$2.80)

Wallace, Bertran F. ***Desegregation and Its Implications for Vocational and Career Education***, 1977 (OC 30—$1.75).

Wills, Joan. ***Youth Unemployment: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***. 1977 (OC 32—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. and Ford, Gerald R. ***Bringing the World of Work and the Institutions of Education Closer Together***, 1977 (OC 28—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. ***Community Education Work Councils***, 1976 (OC 17—$1.00).

ORDERING INFORMATION

All prices include postage and handling. When ordering use series numbers and titles. Orders of $10.00 or less will be accepted on a cash, check, or money order basis only. Purchase orders will be accepted for orders in excess of $10.00. Please make check or money order payable to: **The National Center for Research in Vocational Education**. Mail remittance and/or purchase order to: National Center Publications, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210. (Prices subject to change.)